

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/010,193

Applicant(s)

Garrison et al

Examiner

Tariq Hafiz

Group Art Unit

2166

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tariq Hafiz(3) Romain Jeanty(2) Hans Dreyer(4) Alfred StandickiDate of Interview Oct 16, 2001

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ Applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Chang et al, 5884288

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ Was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant's representative pointed out alleged differences between Chang and their invention. The examiner disagreed and stated that Chang reads on claim 1. After the inability to agree, a detailed discussion between the applicant's and examiner on claim 1, the applicant wished to further discuss claim 35. Since the examiner did not receive any agenda, the examiner was not prepared to discuss claim 35, and due to time constraints (after 40 minutes) it was recommended that the attorney reschedule the interview with an agenda so that the examiner could properly be prepared to discuss those issues with the attorney. For sake of time efficiency of the examiner and the applicant's representative, it is best to reschedule the interview to discuss other issues. Since the applicant's attorney came with list of issues to discuss, and only claim 1 had been discussed over the phone several times. The examiner expected only a brief discussion on claim 1 since the case is finally rejected and notice of appeal filed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.